DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 850 HE 003 055

AUTHOR Richard, Harold G.
TITLE Perceptions of Philosophies of Significant Others and Their Correlations with Institutional Functioning and Institutional Response to Student Demand for Change.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the 1972 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, April 3-7, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; College Faculty; Educational Change; *Higher Education; *Student Characteristics; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Militancy

ABSTRACT

It has been determined by previous studies that student uprisings and demands could not be successful if the college faculty were not in support of the cause. The present study was conducted to verify certain expectations of the author concerning student-faculty relationships and attitudes. In particular, it was expected that faculty and student perceptions of the attitudes and orientations of others would be correlated with their perceptions of institutional functioning and of institutional response to student pressures for change. Specifically, the author expected to find that student and faculty perceptions of institutional functioning and of institutional response to student demands for change would be correlated with: (1) their perceptions of the numerical strength of various faculty and student types within the institutions under study; (2) student faculty nonprofessional statuses such as politics, sex, and religion; and (3) the faculty and student major field of study. The conclusions reached in this paper are tentative since analyses of the study data are still continuing. (HS)

ED 063850

4.15

A Paper On

HE
N-1090

PERCEPTIONS OF PHILOSOPHIES OF SIGNIFICANT OTHERS AND THEIR CORRELATIONS WITH INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE TO STUDENT DEMAND FOR CHANGE

Prepared for

The 1972 Annual Convention

of the

American Educational Research Association

By

Harold G. Richard

The Pennsylvania State University

University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

HE 003 055

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEH REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTRODUCTION

Recent issues in the Jossey-Bass series on "Current Issues in Higher Education" have borne provocative titles reflecting recent unrest on College and University campuses. In 1968 there was Stress and Campus Response, in 1969 there was Agony and Promise, and in 1970 there was The Troubled Campus. The troubled campus has been troubled not only by international and national issues but also by parochial issues which are equally pressing to many members of the academic community. Deeply concerned and sometimes "involved" were both faculty and student members of the academic community interacting in complex modes. Both students and faculty pressed now here now there, trying to achieve change.

Whatever the effect of students on changes in academe, it is more and more apparent that they cannot do it alone. In an article titled, "The Whys and Hows of Student Revolt" (1), J. W. Anderson says,

> The crucial element in a student uprising is a faculty support. Without help from the faculty, the uprising fails. With some substantial degree of support among the faculty, the uprising becomes immune to retaliation by the university's administrators.

If the faculty then plays a crucial role in student pressures for change, it is important to understand the interaction between faculty and students. It is important to seek information and knowledge about the varieties of orientations and inclinations of both faculty members and students and to try to relate the two.

Subsequent to the disruptions at Columbia University in the spring of 1968, Stephen Cole and Hannelore Adamsons sought to identify the

determinants of faculty support for student pressure for change at Columbia. In a report of their study, "Determinants of Faculty Support for Student Demonstrations", (2) they:

> . . . conclude that a faculty member's attitude toward student demonstrations is more influenced by his experience before entrance to the profession than by experience after entrance.

They also note that:

> Conversion of attitudinal into behavioral support was largely dependent (at Columbia) on the attitudes of one's faculty colleagues and students.

Based on the above findings and on the literature of conformity, interaction, and students in college, it was expected that the data from the Herbert Aurbach and Hans Flexner study of "Institutional Response of Four-Year Liberal Arts Colleges to Student Pressures for Change", would support and extend the Cole and Adamsons findings. In particular, it was expected that faculty and student perceptions of the attitudes and orientations of others would be correlated with their perceptions of institutional functioning and of institutional response to student pressures for change. Specifically, we expected to find that student and faculty perceptions of institutional functioning and of institutional response to student demand for change would be correlated with:

1. Their perceptions of the numerical strength of various faculty and student types within the institutions under study.
2. Student and faculty non-professional statuses such as politics, sex, and religion.
3. Faculty and student major field of study.

This paper reports on the analysis of the data which seeks to verify

the validity of the above expectations. Analysis of the study data is continuing so it is necessary to state that conclusions reached are tentative.

INSTRUMENTS

Two separate instruments were devised and administered to all faculty and to a random sample of students at State College, Ivy College, and Coalton College[1] in Pennsylvania. The two instruments were alike except for a reduction of dimensions and items comprising these dimensions for the Institutional Functioning Inventory section of the instruments. The instruments consisted of the following sections:

1. An Institutional Functioning Inventory section based on an instrument developed by Columbia University and the Educational Testing service. (3)
2. A specially developed section probing perceptions of institutional response to student pressures for change.
3. A self-typing section asking students and faculty members to type themselves in accordance with the Peterson typology (4) or a modified Clark typology (5) respectively.
4. A section asking respondents to estimate the percentages of faculty and of students at their institution that would fall within the appropriate faculty and student types.
5. An demographic section probing membership in selected professional, preprofessional, and non-professional statuses.

---

[1] Fictitious names are used for the institutions actually studied.

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF OTHERS

One expectation was that student and faculty perceptions of institutional functioning and of institutional response to student demand for change would be correlated with their perceptions of the relative strengths of various faculty and student types within the institutions. The first task of the research was therefore directed toward determining how the students and faculty viewed the rest of the academic community.

In the following discussion, the terms predominant group, lesser group, significant group, and insignificant group will be used. The term predominant group is used to designate groups having a numerical strength of approximately 25 percent or greater as determined by self-classification. Lesser groups are groups which have a numerical strength of 5 percent of greater. Significant groups is applied as an inclusive term including both predominant and lesser groups. Insignificant groups are those whose numerical strength was less that 5 percent.

State College

Faculty Perceptions of Faculty Types

At State College, Local-Academics and Local-Vocationalists predominated. They constituted respectively 46 and 36 percent of the faculty.[2] Cosmopolitan-Vocationalists and Advocates aggregated constituted a minority group of about 13 percent. Table 1 shows a breakdown of predominant and lesser group perceptions by percentages and by ranking derived from those percentages.

---

[2] Perceptual percentages will not add to 100% since they represent means of estimations. Additionally, insignificant groups and rounding errors will cause actual percentages to vary from 100%.

Insert Table 1 here

Figure 1 showsthat the predominant and the lesser groups tended, although not universally, to overestimate the strength of the lesser groups. The lesser groups tended to underestimate the strength of the predominant groups, although again not invariably. However, as Figure 1 (c) shows, all significant types ranked the predominant types as being among the top two. One can conclude that at State College, the Locals were correctly preceived as being the significant types of faculty.

Faculty Perceptions of Student Types

Faculty perceptions of the strengths of student types is also revealing. Table 1 breaks down the perceptions of faculty predominant and lesser types relative to student types.

Insert Table 2 here

From Table 2 we see a tendency of the faculty to underestimate the strength of Professionalists, Collegiates, and Intellectuals. They tend to overestimate the strength of Vocationalists and of Ritualists. Interestingly both predominant and lesser groups elevated the Vocationalists to first rank among the student body. The lesser groups elevated the Ritualists to second rank among the student body. These data would seem to say that although Vocationalists and Ritualists were a lesser group by self-classification, they were perceived by one or another type as being a predominant group. Consideration of these types reveals that this result may not be as surprising as one might at first assume. Both Professionalists and Vocationalists are career oriented. Both Collegiates and Ritualists are college oriented. Where

the students might think of themselves as Professionalists, faculty might well identify some of these as Vocationalists. Where students might think of themselves as Collegiates, the faculty might well identify some of these as Ritualists.

Coalton College

Faculty Perceptions of Faculty Types

At Coalton, self-classification reveals that Local-Academics constitute the predominant faculty type. Local-Academics compose 67 percent of the faculty. Local-Vocationalists and Cosmopolitan-Academics are the lesser groups accounting for 16 percent and 9 percent of the faculty respectively. Table 3 summarizes the perceptions of the faculty relative to the strengths of the various types represented in the campus community.

Insert Table 3 here

This table as do previous tables, presents some examples of the false perceptions of relative strengths which seem to prevail among the faculties at the institutions studied. The predominant group grossly underestimated its own strength and overestimated the strength of the lesser groups. The Cosmopolitan-Academics were fairly close in their perceptions of faculty others. The Local-Vocationalists substantially underestimated the strength of the predominant group and greatly overestimated their own strength. Table 3 (d) reveals further the discrepancy in perceptions of the lesser groups at Coalton. Local-Vocationalists thought of themselves as the predominant group. A possible explanation lies in a possible misreading of Local-Academics as Local Vocationalists. This might be understood as reflecting the per-

ception that the instituion itself is job oriented. Table 3 (c) reveals that although the Local-Academics underestimated their strength, they did correctly perceive their relative position and that of the lesser groups.

Faculty Perceptions of Student Types

Coalton faculty perceptions of student types showed similar pattern of misperception as evidenced at State College. Table 4 summarizes the Coalton faculty perceptions by types, first in terms of percentages then in terms of rank derived from the percentages.

Insert Table 4 here

The Coalton faculty did not underestimate the Professionalists as much as the State College faculty did. Nor did the Coalton faculty underestimate the Collegiates by as much as did the State College faculty. Academics were correctly estimated but the estimate of Intellectuals was about half of the self-classification percentage. Here as at State College, both the Vocationalists and the Ritualists are overestimated in terms of percentages. Consideration of Figure 4 (b) shows similar patterns of interchange of types as seem at State College. Professionalists and Vocationalists are interchanged as are the Collegiates and Ritualists. The Collegiate-Ritualists interchange at Coalton is not as strong as it was among the lesser types at State College. The relative rank remains the same except for the Cosmopolitan-Academic estimate. However, there is the underestimation of Collegiates and the overestimation of Ritualists.

Ivy College

Faculty Perceptions of Faculty Types

At Ivy College there are only two significant groups among the faculty. The Local-Academics and the Cosmopolitan-Academics constitute roughly 81 percent and 14 percent of the faculty. Since the 14 percent of the sample represents such a small number of actual respondents we will not attempt to evaluate their perceptions. Table 5 shows the Local-Academic type's perceptions of other faculty.

Insert Table 5 here

The predominating Local-Academics greatly underestimated their strength. They spread some of this underestimation among the various types. A large proportion of the underestimated strength is attributed to the Advocates thus elevating them almost to the strength of the Cosmopolitan-Academics. It would appear that in the eyes of the Local-Academics, the Advocates are a significant group among the faculty.

Faculty Perceptions of Student Types

Ivy College faculty perceptions of the student body did not follow the patterns which were seen at State College and at Coalton College. The faculty did not tend to underestimate its Professionalists. It thought that the Professionalists represented a larger group than it actually did. The faculty underestimated the Intellectuals and overestimated the Academics. This possibly represents a similar sort of interchange as seen in the Professionalist-Vocationalist and the Collegiate-Ritualist interchange commented on at State College and at Coalton College. Vocationalists were not even perceived as being a

group of any significance. There was the same tendency to underestimate Collegiates. Table 6 presents the perceptions of the Ivy College Local-Academic type.

Insert Table 6 here

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF OTHERS

It is also important to know which types among the faculty and students are perceived as being numerically significant to the various types of students. Students, like faculty showed some interesting patterns of misperception of the numerical strength of others among students and faculty.

State College

Student Perceptions of Student Types

The two predominant groups of students at State College as indicated by self-classification are the Professionalists and the Collegiates. These two types constituted respectively 28 percent and 40 percent of the student body. Three other types constituting lesser groups were the Vocationalists, the Ritualists, and the Intellectuals. Combined these latter groups account for about 33 percent of the students. Table 7 presents the perceptions of State College students as they relate to student types.

Insert Table 7 here

The predominant student type at State College are the Collegiates. They correctly see themselves as the predominant group although they

underestimate their strength. They evaluate both Vocationalists and Collegiates as groups of greater strength than Professionalists which actually ranks second by self-classification.

The Professionalists mistakenly perceive of themselves as the predominant group. They greatly underestimate the strength of the Collegiates and overestimate the strength of the Ritualist. This possible exchange of strength between Collegiates and Ritualists has been seen before on the part of faculty perceptions.

The interchange of Professionalists-Vocationalist and Collegiates-Ritualists is seen even more pronouncedly in the perceptions of the lesser groups as shown in Figure 7 (a). Figure 7 (d) shows how the Vocationalists are elevated to top rank by all of the lesser groups. Ritualists are also seen to be evaluated higher than is deserved by self-perception.

Student Perceptions of Faculty Types

Table 8 presents the student evaluations of faculty types.

Insert Table 8 here

This figure shows that students underestimated the strength of the Local-Academics by a factor of 2. Although they were close in their estimations of Local-Vocationalists, the underestimation of the other group made the Local-Vocationalists the predominant group in the eyes of the students. The students likewise reversed the ranking of Cosmopolitan-Vocationalists with that of the Advocates. Advocates were perceived as being much stronger than they actually were. There seems to be substantial unanimity of student ranking of faculty in

spite of the reversals. In other words, the relative rankings are consistent.

Coalton College

Student Perceptions of Student Types

The students at Coalton also showed a wide diversity of orientations. No group comprised more than 28 percent of the students. Students who were willing to classify themselves as Left-Activists or Hippies amounted to about 2 percent. Table 9 presents comparisons of predominant and lesser group perceptions of student types.

The predominant two types do not interchange the rankings of the Professionalists and Vocationalists. They do significantly increase the ranking of the Ritualists. This inclination has been seen before. However, here it appears to be at the expense of the Collegiates only for the Professionalists. The Collegiates contrarily inflate the Ritualists at the expense of the Professionalists.

The lesser groups seem to follow the patterns of State College. That is, whereas the Professionalists and the Collegiates predominate based on self-classification. Table 9 (d) shows the tendency to interchange Professionalists for Vocationalists and Collegiates for Ritualists.

Student Perceptions of Faculty Types

Coalton student perceptions of the faculty type strength is shown in Table 10. This table reveals that the students correctly

Insert Table 10 here

ranked the main groups of the faculty. However, they greatly under-

estimated the strength of the predominant group, the Local Academics. Some of this strength went to the Cosmopolitan-Academics and to the Local-Vocationalists. However, much of the strength went to Advocates and Activists whose actual strength was insufficient to even warrant consideration. Table 11 compares the actual and perceived strength of Advocates and Activists.

Insert Table 11 here

Ivy [redacted] College

Student Perceptions of Student Types

Interestingly, the Haverford student perception data reveals no apparent patterns of false perception as was apparent at State College and at Coalton College. The data is summarized in Table 12. Although there are some obvious misperceptions they do not seem to form

Insert Table 12 here

any overall pattern. The closest thing to a pattern is the Left-Activist and Ritualist reading of Ritualists as constituting the most significant group. This tendency of the Ritualist to overrate their own strength can be seen throughout the data on the part of one group or another. The Left-Activist ranking of Ritualists as constituting the predominant group might be explained in terms of a possible Activist inclination to think of the student body as generally apathetic hence Ritualist. Also worthy of note is the similarity of perceptions of student type strength by the Professionalists and the Local-Academic faculty type.

Student Perceptions of Faculty

Table 13 shows the students perceptions of Ivy College faculty type strength. As previously noted, the sample suggests that Advocates and Activist represent a very small minority. Yet stu-

Insert Table 13 here

dents clearly overestimate their strength, primarily at the expense of the Professionalists. This is similar to the situation noted at Coalton College.

SUMMARY OF PERCEPTION FINDINGS

The Faculty

In general it can be said that at all three institutions, Locals predominated over Cosmopolitans and in particular Local-Academics over Cosmopolitan-Academics. There was a general tendency to underestimate the numerical strength of the predominant groups substantially and to over rate the strength of the lesser groups of faculty. Generally, rankings derived from perceived percentages were consistent with rankings derived from self-classification.

The faculty at State College and at Coalton College showed a general tendency to overestimate Vocationalists and Ritualists at the expense of Professionalists and of Collegiates. A possible explanation of this has already been offered. It can be said that the faculty apparently thought of these two institutions as being vocationally oriented with a significant subculture of Collegiates and/or Ritualists. They were not seen as Intellectual, Academic, or Pro-

fessional. Ivy College students on the other hand were seen by the faculty as primarily Professional, Academic, Intellectual with a significant subculture of Collegiates and/or Ritualists.

The Students

The students followed the pattern of the faculty with respect to their evaluation of other students at State College and at Coalton. There was the same tendency to interchange Professionalists for Vocationalists and Collegiates for Ritualists. This was particularly true for the lesser groups of the students. There were no apparent patterns of type interchange at Ivy College.

In general, the students correctly perceived the relative rankings of the various faculty type. There was a general tendency to underestimate the predominant types and to inflate lesser types. The lesser types most likely to be inflated were the Advocates and Activists although there were very few of these at any of these three institutions as indicated by self-classification.

IFI AND SPIR CORRELATIONS WITH STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

It was expected that Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI) and Student Perception of Institutional Response (SPIR) to student demand for change scores would be correlated with perceptions of significant others. In order to evaluate this Pearson Correlation runs were made for selected types at all three institutions to see if any patterns of correlation would become evident. Table 14 shows

the number of correlations above an absolute value of .3 at a significance level greater than 2 percent.

Insert Table 14 here

No particular pattern emerges from this data. It may be remembered that Vocationalists were seen as a significant type by both State College and Coalton College faculty. Yet, a large number of correlation arose only at Coalton College. Table 15 shows a similar table derived from student perceptions at the various institutions.

Insert Table 15 here

Again, no patterns seem to emerge from this approach.

At this stage of the research it seems necessary to say that although perceptions of institutional functioning and of institutional response to student demand for change are correlated with perceptions of the numerical strength of significant others, the patterns of correlations are not clear. It would seem to be a case of sometimes numerical strength is important and sometimes it is not.

IFI AND SPIR CORRELATIONS WITH MAJOR FIELD

Nicholas J. Demerath and his Associates in Power, Presidents, and Professors makes reference to the possible implications of differing truth strategies as reflected in different disciplines on university management. Paul L. Dressel in The Confidence Crisis also refers to administrative implications of differences in disciplines. (7) Feldman and Newcomb (8) delve at length into patterns of values within different major fields. These and other aspects of the literature led

us to expect that we might find correlations with some continuum of the major fields selected by the respondents in the demographic data. If patterns were evident here they might help us to understand the interactions among faculty and students.

The following continuum was hypothesized:

- - Social Sciences-Humanities and Fine Arts-Education-Science-Business - -

This continuum of major field was correlated with IFI scores and SPIR scales. Correlations equal to or greater than .3 at a significance level equal to or greater than 2 percent were sought. It was found that, for the faculty at Ivy College the IFI dimensions of Human Diversity, Self-Study and Planning, and Intellectual-Aesthetic-Extracurricular reached the specified correlation levels. No other correlations at the specified level were found. Many possible explanations for the lack of correlation might be offered. None are presently considered satisfactory.

IFI AND SPIR CORRELATIONS WITH NONPROFESSIONAL STATUSES

There are many reasons to believe that perceptions of institutional functioning and of institutional response to student pressures for change should be correlated with nonprofessional statuses. Cole and Adamsons found that,

> Religion, political affiliation, father's occupation, age and sex were all correlated with attitudinal support of the demonstration.

In order to evaluate this aspect of possible faculty and student interaction, correlations were run of IFI scores and SPIR scales with the

demographic variables of sex, politics, and religion. Both students and faculty at all three institutions were examined. Correlations were sought equal to or greater than .3 at a significance level of 2 percent. First, the students.

The only correlations at the desired level were with politics or with religion. At State College and at Coalton College, the IFI dimension of Democratic Governance was correlated with politics. At State College, the SPIR dimensions of Participation in Discussion, Required Student Action, and Consequences for Students were also correlated with politics. At Ivy College, the SPIR dimension of Consideration was correlated with religion.

For the faculty, as with the students, most of the correlations were with politics. At State College and at Coalton College, the IFI dimensions of Advancing Knowledge and Instituional Esprit were correlated with politics. At Coalton College, the additional IFI dimensions of Undergraduate Learning, Meeting Local Needs, Democratic Governance, and Concern for Innovation were also correlated with politics. The SPIR dimension of Participation in Discussion was also correlated with politics at Coalton College. Finally, the SPIR dimension of Required Student Action was correlated with religion at Ivy College.

Again, there are no apparent patterns of correlation with nonprofessional statuses. The correlations which occur are for the most part understandable but they form no patterns leading to insight.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ANDERSON, J. W. "The Whys and Hows of Student Revolt". The Washington Post. June 30, 1968.

2. COLE, S. and Adamsons, H. "Determinants of Faculty Support for Student Demonstrations". Sociology of Education, 1969. (42, 315-329)

3. _____ Educational Testing Service. Manual of the Institutional Functioning Inventory. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

4. PETERSON, R. E. "The Student Life in American Higher Education". Daedalus, 1968. (97, 293-317)

5. CLARK, B. R. "Faculty Cultures". In T. F. Lunsford (Ed.), The Study of Campus Cultures. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

6. DEMERATH, Nicholas J., Stephens, Richard W., and Taylor R. Robb, Power, Presidents and Professors. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1967.

7. DRESSEL, Paul L., Johnson, F. Craig, and Marcus. Philip M. The Confidence Crisis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1970.

8. FELDMAN, Kenneth A. and Newcomb, Theodore M. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1969.

Companion Papers for Presentation at the 1972 Convention of the American Educational Research Association

9. FLEXNER, Hans and Aurbach, Herbert. Response of Four-Year Colleges to Student Pressures for Institutional Change.

10. SEAGREN, C. Donald. Differences in Perceived Institutional Functioning and Responsiveness to Change as Related to Faculty Types in Selected Four-Year Colleges.

11. QUATROCHE, Thomas J. Differences in Perceived Institutional Functioning and Responsiveness to Change as Related to Student Types in Selected Four-Year Colleges.

TABLE 1

STATE COLLEGE FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY TYPE STRENGTH

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: L.Acad.	L.Voca.	Actual	Percentage
L.Acad.	43	27	46	
L.Voca.	29	44	36	
C.Voca.	9	9	7	
Advoca.	8	8	6	

(a)

Predominant Groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: C.Voca.	Advoca.	Actual	Percentage
L.Acad.	37	24	46	
L.Voca.	27	32	36	
C.Voca.	17	10	7	
Advoca.	5	18	6	

(b)

Lesser Groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: L.Acad.	L.Voca.	Actual	Rank
L.Acad.	1	2	1	2 1
L.Voca.	2	1	2	1 2

(c)

Predominant and Lesser Groups

TABLE 2

STATE COLLEGE FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT TYPE STRENGTH

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: L.Acad.	L.Voca.	Actual	Percentage
Profes.	20	17	28	
Colleg.	16	17	44	
Intell.	6	6	8	
Vocatl.	36	36	15	
Ritual.	13	12	10	

(a)

Predominant Groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: C.Voca.	Advoca.	Actual	Percentage
Profes.	12	17	28	
Colleg.	14	14	44	
Intell.	8	5	8	
Vocatl.	39	46	15	
Ritual.	18	16	10	

(b0

Lesser Groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: L.Acad.	L.Voca.	Actual	Rank
Profes.	2	2	2	
Colleg.	3	3	1	
Intell.	5	5	5	
Vocatl.	1	1	3	
Ritual.	4	4	4	

(c)

Predominant groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: C.Voca.	Advoca.	Actual	Rank
Profes.	4	4	2	
Colleg.	3	3	1	
Intell.	5	5	5	
Vocatl.	1	1	3	
Ritual.	2	2	4	

(d)

Lesser Groups

TABLE 3

COALTON COLLEGE FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY TYPE STRENGTH

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: L.Acad.	Actual Percentage
L.Acad.	43	67
C.ACAD.	13	9
L.Voca.	25	16

(a)

Predominant Group

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: C.Acad.	L.Voca.	Actual Percentage
L.Acad.	63	34	67
C.ACad.	13	11	9
L. Voca.	10	43	16

(b)

Lesser Groups

Group Perceived	Perceiving: L.Acad.	Actual Rank
L.Acad.	1	1
C.Acad.	3	3
L.Voca.	2	2

(c)

Predominant Group

Group Perceived	Perceiving: C.Acad.	L.Voca.	Actual Rank
L.Acad.	1	1	1
C.Acad.	2	3	3
L.Voca.	3	1	2

(d)

Lesser Group

TABLE 4

COALTON COLLEGE FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT TYPE STRENGTH

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: L.Acad.	C.Acad.	L.Voca.	Actual Percentage
Profes.	22	14	25	24
Colleg.	20	16	17	28
Academ.	8	7	7	8
Intell.	7	7	5	13
Vocatl.	30	31	30	16
Ritual.	14	21	13	10

(a)

Singnificant Groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: L.Acad.	C.Acad.	L.Voca.	Actual Rank
Profes.	2	4	2	2
Colleg.	3	3	3	1
Academ.	6	5	5	6
Intell.	5	6	6	4
Vocatl.	1	1	1	3
Ritual.	4	2	4	5

(b)

Significant Groups

TABLE 5

IVY COLLEGE FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY TYPE STRENGTH

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: L.Acad.	Actual Percentage
L.Acad.	50	81
C.Acad.	18	14
Advoca.	12	2

TABLE 6

IBY COLLEGE FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT TYPE STRENGTH

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: L.Acad.	Actual Percentage
Profes.	27	21
Colleg.	16	26
Academ.	16	8
Intell.	15	22
L.Act.	7	6
Ritual.	11	12

TABLE 7
STATE COLLEGE STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT TYPE STRENGTH

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: Profes.	Colleg.	Actual	Percentage
Profes.	26	10	28	
Colleg.	19	30	44	
Intell.	7	8	8	
Vocatl.	16	15	15	
Ritual.	18	20	10	

(a) Predominant Groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: Intell.	Vocatl.	Ritual	Actual	Percentage
Profes.	15	11	10	28	
Colleg.	15	24	23	44	
Intell.	12	7	6	8	
Vocatl.	24	27	21	15	
Ritual.	18	15	24	10	

(b) Lesser Groups

TABLE 8
STATE COLLEGE STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY TYPE STRENGTH

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: Profes.	Colleg.	Actual	Percentage
L.Acad.	23	23	46	
L.Voca.	36	30	36	
C.Voca.	10	11	7	
Advoca.	12	12	6	

(a) Predominant Groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: Intell.	Vocatl.	Ritual.	Actual	Percentage
L.Acad.	19	17	27	46	
L.Voca.	28	37	32	36	
C. Voca.	8	13	8	7	
Advoca.	13	12	11	6	

(b) Lesser Groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: Profes.	Colleg.	Actual	Rank
Profes.	1	4	2	
Colleg.	2	1	1	
Intell.	5	5	5	
Vocatl.	4	3	3	
Ritual.	3	2	4	

(c) Predominant Groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: Intell.	Vocatl.	Ritual	Actual	Rank
Profes.	3	4	4	2	
Colleg.	4	2	2	1	
Intell.	5	5	5	5	
Vocatl.	1	1	1	3	
Ritual.	2	3	3	4	

(d) Lesser Groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: Profes.	Colleg.	Actual	Rank
L.Acad.	2	2	1	
L.Voca.	1	1	2	
C.Voca.	4	4	3	
Advoca.	3	3	4	

(c) Predominant Groups

Group Perceived	Group Perceiving: Intell.	Vocatl.	Ritual.	Actual	Rank
L.Acad.	2	2	2	1	
L.Voca.	1	1	1	2	
C.Voca.	3	4	3	4	
Advoca.	3	4	3	4	

(d) Lesser Groups

TABLE 9
COALTON COLLEGE STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT TYPE STRENGTH

Group Perceived	Profes.	Colleg.	Actual
Profes.	24	15	24
Colleg.	19	26	28
Academ.	6	7	8
Intell.	7	8	13
Vocatl.	15	14	16
Ritual.	19	17	10

Group Perceiving — Percentage

(a)
Predominant Groups

Group Perceived	Academ.	Intell.	Vocatl.	Ritual.	Actual
Profes.	14	15	18	13	24
Colleg.	16	17	17	16	28
Academ.	5	9	6	6	8
Intell.	14	9	11	8	13
Vocatl.	17	17	28	17	16
Ritual.	26	20	14	27	10

Group Perceiving — Percentage

(b)
Lesser Groups

Group Perceived	Profes.	Colleg.	Actual
Profes.	1	3	2
Colleg.	3	1	1
Academ.	5	5	6
Intell.	6	6	4
Vocatl.	4	4	3
Ritual.	2	2	5

Group Perceiving — Rank

(c)
Predominant Groups

Group Perceived	Academ.	Intell.	Vocatl.	Ritual.	Actual
Profes.	4	4	2	4	2
Colleg.	3	2	3	3	1
Academ.	6	5	6	6	6
Intell.	5	4	5	5	4
Vocatl.	2	3	1	2	3
Ritual.	1	1	4	1	5

Group Perceiving — Rank

(d)
Lesser Groups

TABLE 10
COALTON STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY TYPE STRENGTH OF SIGNIFICANT GROUPS

Group Perceived	Profes.	Colleg.	Academ.	Intell.	Vocatl.	Ritual.	Actual
L.Acad.	37	27	36	35	33	35	67
C.Acad.	18	14	11	16	14	10	9
L.Voca.	18	19	22	20	26	24	10

Group Perceiving — Percentage

(a)
All Significant Groups

Group Perceived	Profes.	Colleg.	Academ.	Intell.	Vocatl.	Ritual.	Actual
L.Acad.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
C.Acad.	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
L.Voca.	3	2	2	2	2	2	2

Group Perceiving — Rank

(b)
All Significant Groups

TABLE 11
COALTON STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF FACUTLY TYPE STRENGTH OF NUMERICALLY INSIGNIFICANT TYPES

Group Perceived	Profes.	Colleg.	Academ.	Intell.	Vocatl.	Ritual.	Actual
Advoca.	12	16	10	12	11	15	3
Activi.	9	12	8	6	8	8	1

Group Perceiving — Percentage

Numerically Insignificant Groups

TABLE 12
IVY COLLEGE STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT TYPE STRENGTH

Group Perceived \ Group Perceiving	Profes.	Colleg.	Academ.	Intell.	L.Actv.	Ritual.	Actual
Profes.	27	17	17	20	17	23	21
Colleg.	17	20	13	14	17	11	26
Academ.	13	12	15	16	13	11	8
Intell.	14	14	20	19	9	12	22
L.Actv.	8	10	9	8	10	8	6
Ritual.	13	16	11	10	19	24	12

(a)

All Significant Groups

Group Perceived \ Group Perceiving	Profes.	Colleg.	Academ.	Intell.	L.Actv.	Ritual.	Actual
Profes.	1	2	2	1	3	2	2
Colleg.	2	1	4	4	2	4	1
Academ.	4	5	3	3	4	5	5
Intell.	3	4	1	2	6	3	3
L.Actv.	6	6	6	6	5	6	6
Ritual.	5	3	5	5	1	1	4

(b)

All Significant Groups

TABLE 13
IVY COLLEGE STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY TYPE STRENGTH

Group Perceived \ Group Perceiving	Profes.	Colleg.	Academ.	Intell.	L.Actv.	Ritual.	Actual
L.Acad.	41	42	59	57	53	46	81
C.Acad.	11	10	9	9	12	16	14
Advoca.	16	16	6	12	12	14	3
Activi.	13	13	6	9	8	9	3

All Significant Groups

TABLE 14

FACULTY
NUMBER OF IFI AND SPIR CORRELATIONS WITH PERCEPTION OF STRENGTH OF FACULTY AND STUDENT TYPES

Perceived Types		State College				Ivy College		Coalton College		
Faculty	Students	L.Acad.	L.Voca.	C.Voca.	Advoca.	L.Acad.	C.Acad.	L.Acad.	C.Acad.	L.Voca.
L.Acad.			2	1		6		8		
C.Acad.						1	1			1
L.Voca.		4						6		
C.Voca.						1		1		1
Advoca.					1	1			1	
Activi.			1				1			
	Profes.				2			6		
	Colleg.								6	1
	Academ.				4				6	
	Intell.		1	1				1	11	
	Vocatl.				1			11	1	
	L.Acti.				1			1		
	Hippie.				1			1		
	Ritual.				1					

TABLE 15

STUDENT
NUMBER OF IFI AND SPIR CORRELATIONS WITH PERCEPTION OF STRENGTH OF FACULTY AND STUDENT TYPES

Perceived Types		State College					Ivy College					Coalton College				
Faculty	Students	Profes.	Colleg.	Intell.	Vocatl.	Ritual.	Profes.	Colleg.	Academ.	Intell.	Hippie.	Profes.	Colleg.	Academ.	Intell.	Vocatl.	Ritual.
L.Acad.				1		1						2			1		
C.Acad.		2	4	1			1			1							
L.Voca.										1		1	1		3		
C.Voca.			1		1								2				1
Advoca.			1						1					1	3		
Activi.		1		4						1				1			1
	Profes.	1				2		2	1					1			
	Colleg.	1	2					1		1	1	1				1	1
	Academ.		3	3	1							2	2				
	Intell.	3	3	3					1		1						
	Vocatl.	1	3			1			1			1			1		
	L.Acti.	1	8				1					1					
	Hippie.	2	2	3	1				1	1							
	Ritual.	8					1		1				1				